

# Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <a href="http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content">http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content</a>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

To strengthen his arguments against opera, Mr. Boucicault quotes some very absurd lines from a hack-translation of "Lucia." If, however, he had chosen to quote from the original of some of the grand operas, say, for instance, "Les Huguenots," he might have found much to praise, and comparatively little to condemn.

Every art demands a compromise between the reason and the imagination. Opera very possibly demands a greater compromise than any other form of art, but the delight it confers more than repays the extra subordination of the reason. And while amusement is the end sought by patrons of theatres, though Mr. Boucicault may dub opera an "improper association," and say "out with it!" it is very improbable he will accomplish anything toward its banishment.

JULIAN MAGNUS.

## III.

# UN-AMERICAN AMERICANS.

Why did not Arthur Richmond, in his brilliant analysis of the political career of James Russell Lowell, refer to the well-known fact of Mr. Lowell's perfect willingness to serve under Mr. Blaine as Secretary of State, though subsequently, after Mr. Blaine's defeat for the Presidency, the same Mr. Lowell loudly proclaimed his abhorrence of the man and his principles? As an American, I have always been proud of Mr. Lowell's literary acquirements, but I confess that of late I have been anything but proud of his political performances. As an American, therefore, I am not surprised at the arraignment of Mr. Lowell by the modern Junius. Let it be a warning to un-American Americans.

WASHINGTON MESSINGER.

#### IV.

## RIP VAN WINKLE'S MANUAL.

The "Inequalities of Suffrage, complained of by Mr. J. Chester Lyman in the March number of the Review, are not quite so numerous and grievous as he would have us believe. Unfortunately, his article is based upon information derived from "Hill's Manual, 1882," which has led him into many serious misapprehensions. The table presented by Mr. Lyman contains no less than three mistakes in regard to suffrage in North California. It states that citizenship is not required of an elector, which is an error. The length of residence in a county entitling one to vote is given as 30 days, when it should be 90 days. Lastly, it says that an elector "must own 50 acres of land, or have paid his taxes." This was true 33 years ago, but since 1854 the Constitution of North Carolina has not sanctioned a property qualification. It is to be deplored that this Rip Van Winkle's Manual is so untrustworthy; for Mr. Lyman has treated an important subject in a thoughtful manner.

M. H. Caldwell.